

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are presently active; Claims 19-20 having been added by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the title of the specification was objected to for not being descriptive. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, 12-15, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanimizu (U.S. Pat. No. 5,331,146) in view of Landa (U.S. Pat. No. 4,473,865). Claims 2 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanimizu (U.S. Pat. No. 5,331,146) in view of Landa (U.S. Pat. No. 4,473,865). Claims 7, 8, 16, and 17 were objected to for being dependent from a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding the objection to the title, the title has been amended consistent with that suggested in the outstanding Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the title has been overcome.

Regarding the art rejections, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Claim 1, for instance, defines a lighting device having a light source that illuminates an object of illumination, a reflecting member provided opposite the light source so as to direct a first part of illuminating light emitted therefrom to the object of illumination, and a light-blocking member provided between the light source and the object of illumination and between the reflecting member and the object of illumination so as to block the first directed part of the illuminating light and a second part of the illuminating light which second part directly illuminates the object of illumination with a certain ratio of a light-blocking rate for the

first directed part of the illuminating light to a light-blocking rate for the second directly illuminating part of the illuminating light.

With respect to Tanimizu, Applicants respectfully submit that Tanimizu merely discloses a configuration in which a light blocking member (i.e., light-shielding members 11a and 11b) blocks direct light from a light source (i.e., an LED array 1). Indeed, the Office Action acknowledges that Tanimizu does not disclose a reflecting member.¹

With respect to Landa, Applicants respectfully submit that Landa merely discloses a configuration in which light reflected from “Reflector 20 and slats 16 and 18 of reflector 14 bring the collimated light beam to at least a partial focus to illuminate a narrow strip of document 24.” See, column 2, lines 56-58 of Landa. The Office Action associates housing 4 with a light-blocking member and light-blocking means defined in independent Claims 1 and 10 of the present invention.² However, Applicants submit that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Landa that the housing 4 serves as a light-blocking member or light-blocking means that blocks light reflected from the reflector 20 and the slats 16 and 18. Indeed, Figure 2 of Landa show that light from reflector 14 is *not* blocked by the housing 4. Rather, the light is focused inside the housing 4. Hence, neither Tanimizu nor Landa discloses the feature of a light-blocking member (or means) provided between the reflecting member and the object of illumination.

Further, assuming arguendo that the housing 4 of Landa blocks light reflected from the reflector 20 and the slats 16 and 18, neither Tanimizu nor Landa discloses the feature of the present invention defined in independent claims 1 and 10 that a light-blocking member or light-blocking means blocks the first directed part of the illuminating light and a second part of the illuminating light which second part directly illuminates the object of illumination with a certain ratio of a light-blocking rate for the first directed part of the illuminating light to a

¹ Office Action, page 5, lines 3-4.

light-blocking rate for the second directly illuminating part of the illuminating light.

In Page 5 of the Office Action, the Office Action acknowledges that Tanimizu fails to disclose the above-described feature of the present invention (stated in the Office Action as “the blocking member blocking a certain ratio of the first part of light to the second part of light”). However, the Office Action asserts that this feature is disclosed by Landa. However, the Office Action fails to show that Landa discloses the above-described feature of blocking a certain ratio of a first directed part of light to a second part of light that directly illuminates the object. While pages 5-7 of the Office Action enumerate the elements and configurations that are asserted to be disclosed by Landa, the Office Action fails to show evidence that supports the assertion that the Landa discloses blocking a certain ratio of a first directed part of light to a second part of light that directly illuminates the object. Indeed, as seen in Figure 2 of Landa, all light from the illumination source 6 is passed to the reflector 14 by use of reflector 8, characterized in Landa as producing collimated light.³ Such collimated light from reflector 8 would *not* directly illuminate the object. Hence, in Landa, there is no corresponding second part of light that directly illuminates the object.

M.P.E.P. § 2143 requires for a *prima facie* case of obviousness that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Accordingly, with no showing of the above described features in Tanimizu or Landa, the inventions of independent Claims 1 and 10 cannot be achieved by merely combining Tanimizu and Landa.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 10 and the claims dependent therefrom patentably define over Tanimizu and Landa.

Lastly, new dependent Claims 19 and 20 correspond to original Claims 8 and 17 that contained allowable subject matter. Further, new Claims 19 and 20 are supported by page 12,

² Office Action, page 6, lines 8-9.

lines 11-17, of the specification which states that:

The light-blocking members 9 and 9' are positioned across the optical path of the reflected light from the original 100 from each other so that the light directly emitted onto the original 100 from the light source 2 and the light emitted onto the original 100 via the reflecting member 4 are balanced in the quantity of light.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,618

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
GJM:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\239804US\AM.DOC

³ Landa, col. 2, lines 45-51.